Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/667,160	LIM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JAMES C. KERVEROS	2138	

All Participants:

(1) *JAMES C. KERVEROS*.

(2) *Ryan C. Carter*.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: *27 January 2006*

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:
1,8,11,15,16,17,18

Prior art documents discussed:
N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

1/30/06

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

During a telephone interview held on January 27, 2006, the Examiner indicated that the prior arts taken alone or in combination fail to teach, anticipate, suggest or render obvious the claimed invention for the reasons as stated in the Notice of Allowance.
Furthermore, in a subsequent telephone by Applicant's representative Ryan Carter to discuss a proposed preliminary amendment, the Examiner agreed that the proposed claimed invention distinguishes over the prior arts, since deleting the limitation of "transmitting an acknowledgement message to a transmitting terminal, when there is no error in the channel-decoded data frame and when the error is corrected", is considered well known in the art, and as such it has no effect on the patentability of the claims.